

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. <b>08/811,434</b>	Applicant(s) <b>LEE ET AL</b>
	Examiner <b>Scott Bushey</b>	Group Art Unit <b>1724</b>

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Scott Bushey, Primary Examiner

(3) Mr. Neil Yeoman

(2) Mr. Michael B. Hurd, Atty.

(4) Mr. Mike Binkley

Date of Interview Oct 15, 1998

Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No. If yes, brief description:

Model of a section of the column containing the inventive device.

Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending as rejected under the combination of Lee et al '222 and Keller, and added generic claim 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Keller and Lee et al '222

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Hurd disclosed that there was an "on-sale" situation with respect to the downcomer as shown by instant Fig. 2 of the application, but that there should not be an "on-sale" bar since the same feature was disclosed in parent application 08/742,819, which was filed less than one year after the invention was "on-sale". Mr. Hurd also argued that Lee et al '222 and Keller in combination would not have rendered the instant invention obvious since Keller teaches vertically adjustable means for adjusting the vertical height of the passage between the bottom of the downcomer and the lower tray. Any amendment will be fully considered as filed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2.  Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

*Scott Bushey*  
10-15-98  
SCOTT BUSHEY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1724

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.